

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
)
Rumo SATAKE)
)
Serial No.: 09/716,885)
)
Filed: November 20, 2000)
)
For: Method Of Driving Liquid Crystal)
Display Device)
)
Examiner: David Lee Lewis)
)
Confirmation No.: 1074)
)
Art Unit: 2629)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 23313-1450

RESPONSE (H) TO OFFICE ACTION

Applicant has the following response to the Office Action of June 23, 2007.

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 10, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 32 and 35-41 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Nito et al. (US 5,214,523). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As Applicant previously explained, independent Claims 1-3 recite the features of “displaying *a first black level* by the liquid crystal material in a first period; applying *a first voltage* to the liquid crystal material for a first gradation display in a second period just after the first period; displaying *a second black level* by the liquid crystal material in a third period just after the second period; and applying *a second voltage* to the liquid crystal material for a second gradation display in a fourth period just after the second period” (emphasis added).

Applicant again respectfully submits that Nito fails to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

In the Office Action, however, the Examiner provides a description of his interpretation of Nito. However, this description does not specifically state which parts of Nito correspond to the claimed first black level, the first voltage, the second black level and the second voltage. If the Examiner is going to maintain this rejection, then it is respectfully requested that he specifically state which parts of Nito correspond to the first black level, the first voltage, the second black level and the second voltage. Applicant respectfully submits that Nito does not disclose these features.

Therefore, independent Claims 1-3 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by Nito but are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 12-15

The Examiner also continues to reject Claims 12-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito in view of Yamamoto et al. (5,617,229) and Kogushi et al. (US 5,598,284). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As Applicant previously explained, independent Claim 12 recites the features of “applying *a voltage of 0V* to the liquid crystal material in a first period through a single thin film transistor of the plurality of thin film transistors; and performing *a first gradation display* in a second period through the single thin film transistor just after the first period, applying *a voltage of 0V* to the liquid crystal material in a third period through a single thin film transistor of said plurality of thin film transistors just after the second period; and performing *a second gradation display* in a fourth period through said single thin film transistor just after the third period” (emphasis added)

Applicant again respectfully submits that Nito, Yamamoto and Kogushi fail to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

In the Office Action, however, the Examiner provides a description of his interpretation of Nito. However, this description does not specifically state which parts of Nito correspond to the claimed first 0V, the first gradation display, the second 0V and the second gradation display. If the Examiner is going to maintain this rejection, then it is respectfully requested that he specifically state which parts of Nito correspond to the first 0V, the first gradation display, the second 0V and the second gradation display. Applicant respectfully submits that Nito does not disclose these features.

Therefore, independent Claim 12 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed or

suggested by these references, even if combined, but are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9, 11, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7-9, 11, 16, 20-22, 24, 25, 29-31, 33 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito in view of Saishu. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 19 and 28

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6, 19 and 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nito. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 25, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568